California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Central Valley Region

Robert Schneider, Chair



Governor

Sacramento Main Office

11020 Sun Center Drive #200, Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114 (916) 464-3291 • Fax (916) 464-4645 http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley

John Meek Resource Conservation District San Joaquin County 3422 W. Hammer Lane, Suite A Stockton, CA 95219

Alan C. Lloyd, Ph.D.

Agency Secretary

12 September 2005

ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT – SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND DELTA WATER QUALITY COALITION

The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) staff has reviewed the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for the San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition (Coalition) submitted on 1 April 2005. This AMR was submitted by the Coalition to meet the conditions of the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Order No. R5-2003-0826 for Coalitions (Order) under Resolution No.R5-2003-0105.

The attached review summary includes comments, suggestions and clarifications of requirements that are part of the Order, many of which have already been provided to the Coalition in communications with Water Board staff. It has been noted that as a result of the communications, many of the items discussed in the AMR memorandum (attached) have already been addressed by the Coalition

The Coalition has not submitted a Management Practice Survey that is one of the requirements to receive approval of the Coalition Monitoring and Reporting Program Plan (MRPP). A letter clarifying this requirement was sent to the Coalition on 1 April 2005 from Tom Pinkos, Executive Office of the Water Board.

Follow-up to any exceedances requires that communications to the Water Board include actions taken to address the exceedances. Some of these actions may be assessment and implementation of management practices, follow-up monitoring to identify the source, pesticide use evaluations and other activities undertaken to address water quality. To date, all appropriate initial information regarding secondary monitoring and test results was submitted when sample toxicity was indicated. However, appropriate follow-up information regarding pesticide use, management practice implementation and other management activities has not been communicated to the Water Board.

At a minimum, the Coalition should begin collecting this type of detailed information for the surrounding land areas and identifying possible sources for water quality exceedances for the Mokelumne River @ Bruella Road which has exhibited numerous instances of toxicity, as indicated in the table below.

TOXICITY RESULTS MOKELUMNE RIVER @ BRUELLA ROAD

			TIE		Site	Resample
Date	Species	Result	Conducted	TIE Concl.	Resampled	Results
		21%				
		Reduced				
24-Aug-04	Selanastrum	Growth	no	NA	no	
						No
24-Aug-04	Ceriodeaphnia	5% Survival	yes	Inconclusive	no	Persistence
				No TIE was		
		15%		conducted		
		Reduced		due to low		
21-Mar-05	Selanastrum	Growth	no	reduction.	no	
		35%				
21-Mar-05	Ceriodaphnia	Survival	yes		yes	
		8.2%				
		Reduced		Did not meet		No
17-May-05	Selanstrum	Growth	no	TIE trigger	yes	Persistence
		35%				
22-Jun-05	Ceriodaphnia	Survival	yes		yes	

The attached review of the Coalition AMR indicates that the Coalition will need to take into consideration the following specified items:

- Monitoring reports shall contain the raw data sheets for all analysis including *E.coli* and Toxicity analysis.
- Communication reports shall be submitted for exceedances of all water quality parameters, including pH, DO, coliform, pesticides and other parameters that have associated Basin Plan objectives.
- Quality control samples, analysis, and frequency need to be consistent with the Coalition's QAPP requirements.
- Monitoring for irrigation season does need to start with the first month of irrigation and continue monthly through to the last. This will provide for a better characterization of the hydrologic trends of that season, and is consistent with Conditional Waiver requirements.

The Conditional Waiver also requires that, all major drainages must be part of baseline monitoring. At least 20% of the intermediate drainages must be monitored during the first year and the second 20% the second year, etc. By **1 November 2005**, please submit a list that identifies the drainages as baseline, intermediate, and secondary intermediate and that also identifies appropriate monitoring sites. Please also review the monitoring sites for areas that may not be well represented in the current MRP Plan.

The Water Board would like to acknowledge the timely submittal of the 2004 AMR by the Coalition, and recognizes the extensive work involved. We also wish to thank the Coalition for the tour of the Coalition boundaries that was provided to Water Board staff on 26 July 2005. We are confident that continuation of this level of collaboration will help protect water quality and ensure success for the Coalition approach being utilized in the Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver Program.

Resource Conservation District

If have any questions or comments regarding this Annual Report review summary, please contact Dana Thomsen at (916) 464-4847, or dthomsen@waterboards.ca.gov.

Original Signed By:

MARGIE LOPEZ READ Senior Environmental Scientist

Enc: Staff Review of Annual Monitoring Report